



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/572,679

01/08/2007

Shigeyuki Ono

P71174US0

4502

136 7590 02/02/2009

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC  
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.  
SUITE 600  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

LOUDEN, CLIFFORD J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3679

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/02/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/572,679	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ONO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CLIFFORD J. LOUDEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3679	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CLIFFORD J. LOUDEN. (3) JOHN SCHERER.

(2) GREGORY BINDA. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 January 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2 as proposed by applicant on the attached sheets.

Identification of prior art discussed: Schulz et al. (US5529538) & Okuyama (US5558580).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 1 as proposed was discussed in reference to Schulz et al. Specifically in that the diagrams do not give a clear view of any changes in height and what is shown may be a result of the given perspective view. It was agreed that the claim appears to distinguish over the prior art of record. Claim 2 as proposed was discussed in reference to 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> issues, which have been overcome.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Greg Binda/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3679	
---	--